UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

In Praise of Pity - - - *George E. O'Dell*

The Unitarian Minister's Preaching Job - - - - - - - - - - *Lester Mondale*

Final Curtain - - - - *Manfred A. Carter*

An Argentine Philosopher of Naturalism - - - - - - - - - - *John H. Hershey*

"A Fair World for All" - *Edwin H. Wilson*

Western Conference News

Volume CXXXIX NUMBER 5

Chicago, January-February, 1954

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly — *Except During July-August*

Subscription $1.50 — *Single Copies 25 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter October 7, 1952, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

CONTRIBUTORS

Manfred A. Carter: Poet and Minister.

John H. Hershey: Formerly, Minister of the First Congregational Society, Unitarian, West Bridgewater, Massachusetts.

Lester Mondale: Leader of the Philadelphia Ethical Society.

George E. O'Dell: Formerly, Editor of *The Standard.*

Edwin H. Wilson: Director of the American Humanist Association, Yellow Springs, Ohio.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL—Curtis W. Reese 67

ARTICLES—

In Praise of Pity—George E. O'Dell 68
The Unitarian Minister's Preaching Job—Lester Mondale 69
Final Curtain—Manfred A. Carter 71
An Argentine Philosopher of Naturalism—John H. Hershey 73
"A Fair World for All"—Edwin H. Wilson 74

POETRY—

Imperishable—Avonne D. Ballin 78

THE STUDY TABLE—

Freedom Is Qualitative—Jack Mendelsohn, Jr. 76
Mixture of Gossip and Fact—J. Bryan Allin 76
Something of Everything—Harold P. Marley 77
The Self and Organic Unity—John H. Hershey 77
Quick Reference—Sylvanus M. Duvall 78
Important New Books—C. A. Hawley 78

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 79

THE FIELD—

Legal Defense 66
"Tobacco Road"—*ACLU Bulletin* 66

THE FIELD

Legal Defense

The "Committee of 100" of the N.A.A.C.P. Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., has published the story of John Taft Roseburough "told in his own words, in excerpts from sworn testimony in the official trial record, and from the statement made to U. Simpson Tate, Southwest Regional Counsel" of the Fund.

The 19-year-old Negro boy was arrested in December, 1951, on a charge of "house-peeping," and held four days without arraignment and without a lawyer. During this time, he was beaten and threatened with death if he did not sign a confession to the crime of rape of which he was accused. This forced confession was the only evidence used in court!

N.A.A.C.P. attorneys have appealed in the Supreme Court of Texas against the conviction, and will, if necessary, carry their appeal to the United States Supreme Court.

The "Committee of 100" is raising funds for the defense of John Taft Roseburough and for others deprived of liberty because of racial discrimination. Please make checks payable to Allan Knight Chalmers, Chairman, and send to the "Committee of 100," 20 West 40th Street, New York 18, N. Y.

"Tobacco Road"

Dismissal of obscenity charges against Edward Gould, producer of the play, "Tobacco Road," in Providence, Rhode Island, bears out one of the principal arguments made by the American Civil Liberties Union in its "friend-of-the-court" memorandum filed in support of Mr. Gould's appeal from an original obscenity ruling.

In granting a defense motion for dismissal, Superior Court Fred B. Perkins ruled that a play or book must be judged as a whole on questions of morality, holding that the prosecution had not presented enough of the "Tobacco Road" script for the jury to make a proper judgment.

The ACLU had emphasized in its memorandum that a dramatic pro-

(*Continued on page* 78)

UNITY

VOLUME CXXXIX JANUARY-FEBRUARY, 1954 No. 5

EDITORIAL

It is high time that the public relations of the Unitarian and Universalist Movements be oriented toward the great body of liberal opinion in America. The Liberal Religious Movement is more than a merely sectarian "ism." It has to do with the whole structure of the social, political, and economic life of the world. It is a broad cultural movement aiming at the remaking of the total life of man. While theological and ecclesiastical issues are basic and should not be neglected, the wider reaches of liberal religion are such that an appeal should be made to all people of liberal persuasion in all areas of our common life. There has never before been a time when there was such a large body of liberal thought in America as there is today. Its very vastness is cause for uprisings against it on the part of the orthodox-minded. And its unorganized condition makes it difficult to mobilize liberal opinion in a counter attack against the onslaughts of conservative, orthodox, and reactionary forces. I know of no movements better suited by history, by reputation, and by integrity of leadership than are Unitarians and Universalists to serve in the capacity of rallying the total liberal forces of the country in defense of liberal values and in the dissemination of liberal opinions. While not neglecting parish churches and denominational machinery, we should raise our sights to far horizons and take in the whole scope of the ideological landscape. All the modern techniques of communication should be utilized: the press, the radio, the T.V. Wise planning for venturesome programs is obviously called for. The liberal opinion of America can be and must be rallied in behalf of liberal principles and liberal programs of action.

Curtis W. Reese.

In Praise of Pity

GEORGE E. O'DELL

One of the most illuminating sayings in the poems of W. B. Yeats runs thus:

"A pity beyond all telling
Is hid in the heart of love."

But there is love—and love. Pity is hid in the heart of love only if the love is unselfish, concerned with the lover's solicitude for the beloved rather than with his own demand for a return. How often the love between a man and woman ends in failure because it was merely possessive in either or both, passionate perhaps but unsacrificial, and, above all, lacking pity,—lacking tenderness for fault or frailty. Indeed, do we not sometimes love others the more for their weaknesses, which make them human like ourselves?

Not in marriage only, nor only in friendship. We are to "love our neighbors," love mankind. How can we unless we pity? Not only the victim of assault left by the roadside to die, but even the fortunate sometimes secretly suffer. Sometimes they suffer worst of all,—from knowledge of their own inadequacies however disguised; from recognition of the tinsel worth of their success or greatness. The self-seeking "malefactor of great wealth" is not necessarily happy, any more than the common man subjected to hard knocks in life. The crassest person of our acquaintance may seem swollen with vanity, but vanity is rarely happy for long. And how much the callous, the brutal, are missing, in that they do not share in the blessed experiences of kindness, pity, love!

Were Napoleon, Mussolini, Hitler happy men? Far happier many of the most obscure in their lands! "But they *could* have been better (and happier) had they but tried!" Well, that is the conventional moral cry. Of necessity there have to be challenges in the name of a presumed moral freedom in which society's safety is concerned; we must make assumptions and legislate in the light of them. Yet, "there but for the Grace of God" go we, and let us, however we must denounce dangerous conduct, not forget that.

Happiness, except fitfully, (and so precious at that!), is perhaps the lot of but few. Let me not exaggerate. But I am so often touched with sadness because so many faces one sees in the London of today give no hint of pleasure or joy. My American friends visiting this city sometimes come out unexpectedly and unasked with confirmation of my own recognition of the stoically serious faces of the middle-aged. They "took it" ten years ago, do not now often speak of it, and they will "take it" again if they must; they do not speak of it but often sleep only brokenly at night and awake in the dark to sudden shuddering.

But far more calling for a love that has a core of pity is the weakness of will, the knowledge of unrealized ideals, the sense toward a life's end of failure in doing one's best, which can afflict one and all. Ought we to look any in the face, even the seemingly hardened (though perhaps him or her most of all), and not know that after all they are not we, and that even if we must condemn this or that in them we must give pity, too?

Pity for them, but not for ourselves. For human life is haunted not only by the paradox that happiness comes best to those who do not expressly seek it; so, too, are we ruled by the paradox of pity,—that we must accord it to others but not beg it for ourselves. The manly man, the womanly woman, will shrink from being pitied, yet will at least feel sorrow for those flaws in others which are either like or unlike his or her own. Out of such sympathy should come the greatest power to help. From it, too, should come the conviction that a humanly perfect world would be a wearying world. Defect and sorrow, as experiences to be met, struggled with, made terms with, give life worthwhileness and zest such as a heaven upon earth could not so well provide.

The Christian tradition at its purest is surely a plea for pity at the heart of love. Does not the teaching attributed to Jesus, divested of confused and conflicting reportage mostly done long after his death,—does it not express a passion of pity? Sufferers are the people who matter most; the disadvantaged workpeople and the poor, the sick, the persecuted, the unfriended, or the rich who become ashamed of their wealth,—the coming kingdom is especially for them, a realm to be magically created, in accordance with the prevalent expectations of the time. It is one where love that has a heart of pity will reign.

It is not only subsequent church councils and churchmen who have been rigidly mechanical and so have missed the lovely poetic strain in Jesus, but even the reporters themselves sometimes practiced a literalness out of accord with the imaginative habit of the Oriental mind. Jesus himself is credited by them with compromising with the needs of the dull-minded; his remembered precepts sometimes seem strangely inadequate; other sayings of his and his practice go so far beyond them. It is the least original and illuminating which so many of his followers use most in correcting the instinctive, perhaps fundamental, selfishness which conflicts with better promptings in their own souls. It is the old prophetic tradition with which Jesus so shrewdly challenges his hearers: "Love thy neighbor as thyself." But is this enough? Suppose I do not, cannot, love myself. Alas, it is hard for some, even many of us, to do that; rather we are profoundly dissatisfied with ourselves. What, then, are we to do but try to love our neighbor *better* than ourself?

Now, this is no fooling with words. A great psychological truth is here. It is paradox again; let me try to treat my neighbor as better worth my solicitude than am I and there may be revealed and enlivened depths in myself of which I was only dimly if at all aware.

Or there is the injunction that we do to others as we would have them do to us; another equalitarian precept. This also is much earlier than Jesus. It has its place; it is a salutary check on conduct,—and incidentally it has enabled many a man to amass a fortune by advertising a presumably unusual commercial honesty! But, again, is it enough? The Shavian gibe, that the other person's tastes may be different, certainly does not dispose of it; the call really is not for likeness but for equivalence of treatment. Nevertheless, this rough rule of thumb is commonplace, is even archaic; it belongs in the morals necessary even to a crude civilization. The real challenge is more poignant: what is the other like? Not what are his tastes, but what are his true needs? My greatest requirement must be to practice the insight, the love that is enhanced by

pity, through which I may be enabled to serve him, even though he fall short of similarly helping me. It is the same easily missed lesson again.

Jesus is reported as having a very terrible resentment for those who would not follow him. But we cannot know how the reporters were led by their own class prejudices, so that they emphasized this or that. Yet sometimes they did make Jesus sad at the spiritual plight of those who did not share his vision. Was there not in him a prompting of pity even for those who hated him and reviled him? He warned us not to "judge." The psychiatric pastor of today does not judge. He knows that without kindly imagination even simple fairness is difficult. For science and religion together to do their perfect work there must be deep kindness,—a pity at the heart of love.

The Unitarian Minister's Preaching Job

LESTER MONDALE

To avert at the outset any false impressions as to my feelings and intentions, I had better begin this with an apostrophe: To the great Unitarian tradition, to the many Unitarian groups, young and old and borning, I have come to know, to hundreds of individual Unitarians, to scores of most estimable ministers, rugged frontiersmen of the spirit, my feeling is that of the man who is truly in love with his wife. He is truly in love because although he knows her faults and has suffered from them, he loves her still. In protesting this affection I include not only the denomination Unitarian but also that larger American and world liberalism of which Unitarians as well as Universalists and Ethical Culturists and Reformed Jews and Humanists and other like-minded groups are merely the separate *States* of what I hope one day may be a genuinely democratic United States of Religion.

Now, how do I interpret the Unitarian minister's preaching job? Before the noses of the all-too-numerous detractors of preaching I take holy-devil delight in dangling this affirmation: That Unitarian, which is to say liberal, preaching is awesomely, yes even terribly, important—the most important duty of the minister, the most significant function of his church.

In emphasizing so dogmatically the preëminence of preaching, I do so in all personal humility. I know now, after long, bleeding, sweating, weeping years, going into decades, that it is not just *my* preaching that is of such superlative consequence. I have been ground very fine in that mill of the Gods. I also know now that my wife is like every other Unitarian minister's wife who has confided in me: each knows that her husband, if people only knew it, is really just about the ablest preacher in the denomination. I know now, moreover, that every minister, not only I, has his flock-within-the-flock who confide so assuringly that "this *is* the best we have *ever* heard." And how well do I know the sickening sensations evoked by the spectacle of these, the beloved among the crowd, who are in spasms of exultation and adulation over the combined unction and fiery platitudes of the guest preacher with the name! Again, I have been in the game long enough to have gazed more times than I care to tell, aghast and in wonderment at how I could have given vent to this or that *corn,* ears of it, in the four-year-old manuscript . . . to say nothing of what I have found in erstwhile pulpit masterpieces already hoary with ten or twenty years of antiquity.

Nevertheless, I still think that nothing in our work begins to approach in magnitude the importance of preaching. Its indispensability in the economy of the spirit stands even more vividly before my mind today because of the blight which I see everywhere threatening what ought to be its perennial verdure.

To be more explicit about this blight: Preaching today in Unitarian circles is threatened by nothing so much as the spectacular denominational growth of recent years. For any century-old religious body to have increased 40 per cent in fifteen years is nothing short of phenomenal. For this growth we are all to be congratulated, for most if not all of us shared in the making of this success. But, as I wish to place before you now, as *preachers* we are also to be warned about this success, and probably condoned. This growth, except in rare instances, has not come as a result of preaching. That which has attracted the numbers and that which has bound them to the church organization has been the developing church school, religious education.

Let me at this point say a parenthetical word of commendation for religious education. Truly great are the accomplishments in this field by one who altogether too long has labored and at times struggled, unsung and unheralded, in relative obscurity—one Ernest Kuebler. Truly great things cried to be done to offset the wretchedly one-sided church programs of fifteen and twenty years ago, when the Sunday School offered, primarily, the cheapest baby-sitting service available to parents in need of an hour of worship or culture. Religious education, properly implemented at long last, with texts, programs, institutes, and trained directors must be hailed as probably the most significant and necessary institutional and programming development in liberal circles in many a decade. It is where you find the thriving Sunday School today, and particularly where you find the part-time or full-time professional and paid director that you also find the thriving Unitarian or liberal church. It appears to meet a widespread and relatively new demand on the part of young parents the country over for some kind of liberal religious and ethical education for their children.

Now, you ask, what has all this business of success by way of religious education got to do with the blight on preaching?

It affects preaching, to begin with, in this wise: This crowding to the liberal church is in the *interest primarily of the child* . . . not for the adult parent himself. Too many of these parents in their own estimation are already liberalized. They do not believe in the Virgin Birth. And in their minds is little doubt as to what they must do to "live right." If they have any qualms of inadequacy in this regard they are sure that any difficulties can be resolved and the future assured by the techniques of *group dynamics.* They are "liberals." They believe in the United Nations and in race relations dinners. If they are interested in the sermon

and the service, that interest is nevertheless largely incidental to their religious education concerns for their children. If they plunge into the activities of the organization, here again it is highly unlikely that inspiring sermons are the motivation. More likely the plunge is merely one with the drive behind the throwing of themselves into Boy Scouting, P.T.A., League of Women Voters, University Women's Club activities. In this superficially liberalized person's mind the sermon is necessarily a secondary function of the church as well as of the minister's parish activities. The supreme consideration is the child. The child is supreme if only because the parent has failed to find any effectively integrative meanings in life—none apart from a child-centered existence. Moreover, having children—three, four, five—has become the vogue in emancipated, managerial circles. A sizeable and properly clothed family bespeaks ability and competence—*à la* Thorstein Veblen and his canons of pecuniary emulation . . . and waste.

With the baby in the home crib for the first time, then rises before the parent's mind the horrendous implications of that most disturbing cliché: There are "no problem children. There are only problem parents." Burdened thus with a responsibility cut out only for the shoulders of a god—the personal responsibilitity for all the impish vagaries of half a dozen little destinies—he turns in despair to the church school and to the Almighty. Everything for the child. The child, on this primrose path to neuroticism, wonders of course: "If my parents are only for me—what am I for?" And for this question the parent, for want in his spiritual education of preaching that has power and vision, has no answer, except: "Babies!" and for those babies in turn it is P.T.A., and R.E.; and then more babies, *ad nauseam.*

For this person, already emancipated and liberalized, the eleven o'clock Sunday service is essentially a means of keeping parents profitably and culturally occupied while the children are in the Sunday School. The eleven o'clock service to them is a function of the organization that might be termed *parent sitting!*

As a result of the considerable influx into our churches of persons of this particular pattern of culture the churches are going through a marked sociological change. Power is rapidly passing from the old-style first-citizens of the community, from an assured and largely childless gentility, into the administrative hands of these new and dazzlingly vigorous *somatotonics* who are so conspicuous, as I have already indicated, in Leagues of Women Voters, University Women's Clubs, and in the inner managerial dynamics of P.T.A.s.

In this milieu, preaching of the force and vision of a Holmes, a Sullivan, a Dietrich, a Reese, a Park—to make but passing reference to the preaching earlier of Savage, James Freeman Clark, Jenkin Lloyd Jones—has little or no place, except by vestigial, one might almost say, *ritual* right. Instead of the Holmes—yes, instead of the Backus, the Davies, the Ken Patton, the Harvey Swanson, the Leslie Pennington, the Homer Jack, the Pete Samsom—the minister that is most nicely ensemble in this new social nexus is the rector. And unless we wake up and begin to preach to present reality and reassert in no faint language the importance of that one ministerial function that alone can communicate the vision of meaning and significance, I dare say that in fifty years the majority of Unitarian ministers will be indistinguishable from all the rest of the reversed collars and chancel voices.

A child-centered church means eventually, instead of the adult-religious outlook of our great liberal heritage, childish religion. The alternative is religious education to prepare the child for, to fit the child into, adult religion. And adult religion? Who can say what adult religion is except insofar as it may be illustrated by the mind, by the spirit that has a sensitive aliveness to the sublimity and the pathos as well as to the mystery of all existence—that along with this aliveness exhibits the never-ceasing growth in stature and in wisdom that can come only from vision and communicative art. These two combined, the vision and the art, is preaching—preaching that makes great things like the child-centered existence, small; and small things like the value of the ever-burgeoning adult spirit, great.

If ever there were a denominational situation, if ever there were an age that called for Chrysostom preaching, that place and time is now. And particularly is this *our* duty; our duty as ministers, or leaders in a tradition that almost alone in the religious world gives us both freedom and scope to deal with the terrible realities of our times, with the terrible adult realism of fact and human craving and transporting vision.

The sermon is not diverse from nor alien to worship, as a perverted species of religious aesthete would have it. To my mind the sermon is worship. It is that which ought to glow most colorfully and illuminatingly in the service settings of music and response and prayer. To be worship, the sermon must be of that art form which in orthodox circles is illustrated in the advertisement: "We preach Christ crucified." Note carefully: We preach Christ crucified—not *about* Christ crucified . . . exactly as Baker Brownell says of Robert Frost's poetry: it is not *about* New England, it *is* New England. And so with liberal preaching that is worship, adult worship: "We preach life"—the life of the universe, the life of man—not *about* life. We preach life itself with such conviction and experience that those hearing will taste of the life more abundant and from thence go forth with a renewed reverence for life.

The sermon as the affirmation of life will be a means of discovering in ourselves the various latent energies and resources released when the heart is right, for receiving help in meeting problems, for guidance in trouble, for the tasting of new experiences (as one tastes in classical drama and literature), for hope, joy, courage to face up to the many contradictions we have to learn to live with. It should be an opening to the understanding and appreciation of the natural and human world about us. Through it, as through the opening in the dome of an observatory, should come profound thoughts from the philosophers, integrative counsels from the physicians of mental health, some of the worldly-wise humanism of the masters of the pen, as well as aids-to-quiet from the spirit-wise but little known mystics of the world's great religions. Through this opening should flow an ever-increasing understanding of what is happening within our ceaselessly changing and tumultuous social system—together with the burdens of contemporary Amoses and Jeremiahs and Hoseas. And through this opening should come images of bigness among men, of the powerful tenderness of the human relationship at its solidest, and glimpses at times of those never-never but also ever-ever Elysian Fields of that which we label with the word, beautiful.

The preacher of this species is not the shepherd. The congregation that hears him is not the woolly flock. Here is something of a different category. The preacher grows. The following also grows. Each stimulates and inspires and feeds the other. Together they create an evolving organic body and mind larger than any one of the group. And in it and through it each individual thereof becomes someone greater. Thus, as true adult spirits, as beings of infinite possibility, travelling the labyrinthine paths of a reality that is infinite in all its aspects, they progress from sermon to sermon, from mystery to mystery, towards that which the optimistic heart of life's two billion years knows is something great.

Final Curtain

MANFRED A. CARTER

We read some comforting articles about the Atom bombs, but we also read that our army is planning to use them if necessary, in Europe, or in the East. Planes and rockets are ready now! Our play is drawing to a close. The old plot of power ideas comes to its conclusion. We near the final curtain. There must be a new play, or darkness.

There is a creeping terror abroad in the land, fed by hot straws in the wind of public information. Little unrelated incidents add up to horror. In 1947, *Mortuary Science,* a publication for undertakers, said that dead bodies after bombing would be radioactive and that morticians must wear lead-lined clothes. Mourners would have to file by quickly. The army booklet, *How to Survive an Atom Bomb,* denies this and says that it will be safe to handle those who have been affected. But what if the new bombs are worse? The thought still haunts us.

Dorothy Burns of New Jersey died nine months after alleged radioactive poisoning in atomic research. She filed suit for $200,000, but died before the courts acted. A meeting of scientists was held, at Upton, New York, to try to determine the legal period of liability for injury from atomic energy, but how can that be measured which may go on for generations? And what of partial injury? A California biologist has harvested the third generation of corn descended from seeds exposed to the air burst at Bikini. He reports that the frequency of gene mutations is "extremely high." What of future generations of people, exposed like that corn?

Scientists still poke around those experimental ships, labeled dangerous when brought to the West coast after atomic explosions. We are told it was fortunate that the fish which contaminated other fish were not of a migrating kind. There are so many hints of lingering evils that we cannot be easy in our minds about the brevity of atomic explosions.

A subconscious fear haunts our cities, so that a sewer explosion in Brooklyn causes a panic. The Red Cross estimates that it would need half as much blood plasma for one bombed city as was needed for the whole of World War II. There is a creeping terror abroad in the land but we are told to pretend it is not there.

Plans for civilian defense are haltingly instituted. We are told that bomb shelters cost too much, that decentralization is bad for business. We must have business as usual, even in the Armageddon of science. We may yet have universal military training, but our wealthy men must not be limited to $25,000 a year income. Planned cooperative communities are taboo, even though America would be paralyzed without our great cities. Russian economy only needs a few steps back into agricultural life. She would miss her cities far less than we. We are not told that a sufficiency of Geiger counters has ever been produced. The army booklet tells of gallant civilian crews who would wade into the rubble for heroic rescues, but as yet those crews are on dead paper in office files. There are not enough doctors and there will be less, especially if we draft the pre-medical students for gun fodder. Apparently we think of this as a war of offense because America has escaped so long, but the conditions change. Old thinking no longer applies, yet many of our leaders are old men and cannot see the new day.

We frequently read of new speed devices. Our bombers fly around the earth nonstop. Russia has 350 bombers that can reach any part of the United States without refuelling. We read of rockets that go over fifty miles in the air and travel at three thousand miles an hour. Speed shrinks the world. The walls of space grow thin. Then we read a quiet announcement that work on the H-bomb has been successful. There seems to be a new "Hinge of Fate" and it creaks like a radio thriller door, but we cannot turn it off by a twist of the dial. We cannot stop its opening by a casual prayer.

These unrelated stories in the news frighten us but we are used to newspapers. What of the men who know? George Earle, former diplomat, tells Congress: "I don't believe there is better than an even chance that 10 per cent of us Americans will be alive five years from now." One scientist says that 45 million of our people can be wiped out in a single night. That is nearly a third of our population! Twelve of the greatest scientists tell us in a joint statement that one H-bomb can wipe out the largest city in the world and poison the air. Professor Einstein, who started it all with a mathematical formula, says that the H-bomb can destroy all life on earth, and his committee has tried to raise half the price of one A-bomb to inform the public of its danger. These scientists tell us that there is no defense. Glenn Martin, airplane manufacturer, says that the United States has developed a radioactive cloud that "kills anyone who comes in contact with it." He says that it is effective over a much larger area than the atom bomb and "it might make the area it touches radioactive for an indefinite time." He says that the cloud is spread by wind and that its use requires a sure knowledge of the weather or it might backfire on its users. Those who have planned picnics by the weatherman are not sure they want to trust him with the safety of the world! These are not the words of preachers or poets or other dreamers. These are practical men, men who leave the prayers to dreamers. But what is practicality now?

We have been further terrified by such articles as "Hiroshima, U.S.A.," in *Collier's,* by our own Army booklet and that of England. The comforting text has unwritten lines for those with imagination, but the bare facts are bad enough. Eye witnesses tell of Hiroshima long after. Anyone who is going to write his Congress-

man to use the bombs right now on poor peasants in China ought first to read one of these vivid pictures of what even an A-bomb can do. It is not the sudden death at the center which frightens most of us, but the lingering effects of burns, polio, tularemia, parrot fever, psychological gases, and radiation itself. Horror can be tied to a bomb which is worse than explosion. These are the lingering terrors of the unknown. It is terror enough to make even an unbeliever pray, how much more a Christian, but *after* he has spoken his mind for peace, and the means for peace. In Eliot's poem about murder in the cathedral is a line, "Clear the air! Clean the sky! Wash the wind." It is a great deal easier to do that, in a literal sense, now than after an atomic war. If what we read is true, we live in an hour of desperation. It is time for new thoughts about war and peace.

There is much Christian prayer about the H-bomb but not too much clear thinking. Confusion of utterance and evasiveness show this. The Federal Council side-stepped it. The Southern California Methodist conference voted down an appeal to outlaw the H-bomb, but some men there must have thought of it. Reports of city and state programs of prayers for peace come in but not many clear-cut resolutions or programs.

In 1945 the President said, "The atomic bomb is too dangerous to be loose in a lawless world." If that is true of the atomic bomb how much more of future terrors! And yet the only morality of our day seems to be morality of power, and many church people pass the danger off as something which cannot affect them because they are Christians. There were Christians in Hiroshima, too!

It is much easier to pray that God will take it away than to be distrusted as subversive realists. The gradual dominance of the bombing airplane seems to have submerged the power of humanitarian morality, but has it? Is there a submerged power of love and comprehension which we have not released? When the Amsterdam Conference suggested that there were higher laws than either Capitalism or Communism, a newsmagazine headlined it as "Flurry at Amsterdam." The men who rule us now would like to reduce the church to a minor agency of comforting morale and to prevent it from being a determiner of world policy. Prayers that only comfort encourage this attitude. Fond parents put a Testament in a soldier's pocket to keep away bullets. It would be quite a miracle that would save him, in the path of a rocket bomb, and a Bible on the living room table will not take the place of a bomb shelter. Even the shelter is of questionable value. Prayers for personal safety are obviously futile in the target of obliteration bombing. Personal piety is not enough for these days. Cosmic sins demand cosmic repentance. There are Christians enough to change the world, if they were led. If the few fearless journals had the circulation of popular magazines they could do this, but meanwhile we are left to word-of-mouth geometrical progression. What the people say is sometimes as potent as what they read. We cannot leave it all to God. He needs human hands and minds. Our world is ruled too much by yapping radio commentators and their masters but there is a higher power. In one of Benet's stories, he says, "Now we followed a hairy general to an unknown battle over the rim of the world." Who shall rule America, the general or the citizen, the army or the church, Wall Street or Main Street? There is a power in our common humanity, waiting to be released.

The H-bomb is a nightmare. It has not yet been seen. Bacteriological warfare might be worse, with its lingering deaths. I am more frightened of a teaspoonful of vanilla, with a million germs in it, than of sudden death by explosion. These are not separate perils, they can easily be combined. There is a chance for truth and culture to rise from barbarism, but there is no rising from sterile, uninhabited sand.

Better to live in a police state, than to police the world with H-bombs. Bertrand Russell says that is the only way peace can come to the world through force; but the Holy Alliance of the last century could not enforce brotherhood, even on a weary world. There can be World Government but it must be on the basis of reason. Police may control minorities, not populations. Force alone is not strong enough.

The Army booklet complacently states that it would take a million A-bombs to destroy the earth. The potential of atomic energy is said to be one thousand times that of the A-bomb. Even by the army's figure, a thousand times a thousand makes a million. A thousand Super-bombs can depopulate the earth.

The H-bomb spells world suicide, and Americans are trying to make it. Is there no reason left? If we are all going to die what difference does it make if Russia pulls the trigger first or we do? If two duellers are in a gas chamber, it is not the first shot but the ultimate explosion that counts.

Some of us say that we should stop making the H-bomb right now and make peace. We talk about bloodthirsty Russia while we prepare the final cyanide pill for the world! This is not reason. This is not honor. This is insanity, and it has an end in universal death. When the H-bomb is released some of us will be complete instead of partial pacifists, but it will not matter then. That will be the universal curtain call—a curtain of radioactive mist sweeping the world. They tell us if an A-bomb comes we must fall on the ground and cover our faces and not look up. That is what we are doing now when we pray and leave it all to God. God has power, but there must be a new play and a new plot and a new purpose. Otherwise the H-bomb is the final curtain for us all.

The new plot for the new play has a theme of understanding. It tolerates differences. It does not trust force. Let us move on to the new theater. Let us pray for the new world.

Yes, pray that God will control the H-bomb. But first join in some resolution that outlaws it right now. Send a letter to your Congressman. Cheer for civilians not for generals, for the people not for corporations, and remember there are still people in Russia and China, people who want what we want and do not know how to get it.

Yes, pray, but not for comfort. Pray with the agony of straight thinking in an insane world. Pray after you have resisted. Pray for the strength to break up old thought patterns of a lifetime and look at the facts. Pray for courage to speak when it costs something.

Perhaps God will save a remnant somewhere. He has before in history. He does not guarantee that every praying person will be in that remnant. We cannot pray God's help until we live God's law. All the minor sins are as nothing compared to the sin of universal death. This is the final curtain for our form of civilization. Let us move on to the new theater. Let us have a government of the world, a world church, and world peace.

An Argentine Philosopher of Naturalism

JOHN H. HERSHEY

José Ingenieros (1877-1925) was a psychiatrist, sociologist, and philosopher of naturalism in Argentina. His parents were born in Italy. His father, who lived until 1922, was a Socialist and active in revolutionary workers' organizations; his mother lived until 1925. They had emigrated to Argentina where José was born in Buenos Aires. His father had an abundant library and the parents often discussed history, politics, and sociology at home. In this intellectual environment José Ingenieros was reared.

In his later professional career Ingenieros was a medical psychiatrist. He headed the Clinics of Medicine, Law, and Neuropathology of the University of Buenos Aires. He taught nervous and mental pathology, ethics, logic, and aesthetics in the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters at the same university. In 1911 he began the systematic study of the history of philosophy. Later, in January, 1915, he initiated a monthly review of philosophy which continued for twenty years. He also wrote about fifty books dealing with such varied themes as Socialism, crime, sociology, history, psychology, psychiatry, music, love, Soviet Russia.

We shall, however, limit ourselves to the attempt to outline Ingenieros' philosophical attitude. In one of his books, first published in 1918, he criticizes many of the philosophers of the past, states his own definition of philosophy, and reflects on its future. The book in Spanish is his *Proposiciones relativas al porvenir de la filosofía (Propositions Relative to the Future of Philosophy)*.

With rare exceptions during the past four centuries, Ingenieros says in his discussion of past thinkers, philosophers "were often deliberate traitors to their own thinking by preoccupying themselves with not offending common beliefs or with avoiding persecution by the authorities." The "hypocrisy of the philosophers," as he puts it, consisted in their proclaiming two philosophies, one which was their own, and another which was theological in order to comply with common superstitions. More recently this hypocrisy takes another form. Social dogmatism, on the one hand, does concede the liberty to investigate the truth; but, on the other hand, it reserves the privilege of denying the ethical and social consequences of such free search. Philosophy, in short, has often been subordinated to both theology and custom. Bacon, Galileo, Hume, Locke, Spinoza, Descartes, Leibnitz, Kant, Hegel and Spencer were all in reality atheists by an inescapable logical necessity. But they "pretended to be theists being subservient to social dogmatism." The philosophical pantheists, for example, who call Nature "God" thus preserve the word by which the common people mean a hypothetical being distinct from Nature. "There is an evident immorality in this, because the purpose of countenancing deception is here seen. . . . The truth is that humanity, through thousands of years of mystical inheritance, has a horror of atheism."

Turning now to Ingenieros' definition of philosophy, we find that he makes it synonymous with metaphysics. Metaphysics, he holds, is the only kind of philosophy which cannot be converted into science, and it constitutes in the strict sense all philosophy. What then is the goal of philosophy? Its object is to formulate legitimate hypotheses about problems which are beyond present or possible experience. In the following quotation, the first paragraph is an example of a hypothesis that is legitimate, while the second paragraph illustrates a hypothesis that is not legitimate:

> This inexperiential hypothesis is legitimate: That on the surface of other planets matter could exist whose form of equilibrium possesses the properties of assimilation and reproduction which are characterized as living beings on the surface of the earth. . . .
>
> This inexperiential hypothesis is not legitimate: That on other planets human beings exist who have read Descartes' *Discourse on the Method of Reasoning.*

Legitimate philosophical hypotheses, therefore, are those which are logical but cannot be demonstrated, in contrast to scientific hypotheses which are not only logical but demonstrable as well. Also in Ingenieros' definition of philosophy the phrase "beyond experience" occurs. These words do not mean the absolute or things-in-themselves or the transcendental. The expression refers rather to problems in the various natural realms which are not or cannot be solved. "Judging by what little we know, nothing warrants us in thinking that man, in the time which he will live on this cooling planet, will solve all problems which now exceed experience." Hence metaphysics, in the sense defined, will continue to exist.

What of the future of philosophy? Ingenieros favors certain reforms in philosophy, some of which are listed in the following paragraphs:

1. A clear distinction should be made between the history of philosophy and the construction of new systems. This distinction should be made, even though the history of philosophy is useful, among other reasons, in helping us to avoid false problems. "Those feeling themselves capable of begetting children are never occupied with embalming corpses."

2. Future philosophy ought not to develop independently of the sciences, but should start from them as far as is possible. Mysticism, revelation, and intuition are mistaken methods in philosophy. Bergson's philosophy, for example, imposes intuitionism on the sciences and thus his "biological science was the source of admiration for elegant dames, but aroused laughter on the part of those versed in biological studies."

3. The vocabulary of philosophy needs to be revised. Precise terms should replace the vague terms of the classical philosophies. "Kant, in only five of his books, gives 140 (at least) different definitions of metaphysics; many of them are incompatible and some are definitely contradictory." Some philosophers write in difficult language in order to conceal their language or to give the impression of profound thinking. "It does not seem impossible to express clear ideas in simple language; all obscurity and complexity make me suspicious."

4. There will be in the future an increasing impersonality in philosophizing in the sense that scholars will collaborate in groups or schools.

5. Avoiding dogmatism, philosophers in the future will accept the idea of the unlimited perfectibility of metaphysical hypotheses. More and more, writes Ingenieros hopefully, "tolerance for philosophical opinions which do not agree with common beliefs will increase."

Was Ingenieros, as he has sometimes been called, a positivist? Judging by his writings, he believed that Comte's positivism was inadequate as a philosophy. Ingenieros, on the one hand, did not accept the positivist idea that philosophy is merely a synthesis of the sci-

ences, nor on the other hand, did he accept intuitionism. Although he was closely related in many ways to the spirit of positivism, it would seem more correct to call him a philosopher of naturalism rather than a positivist.

Let us now turn to Ingenieros' philosophy of morality. In 1916 he attended the Pan American Scientific Congress held in Washington, D.C. During his stay in the United States he visited Harvard University where he found out more about Ralph Waldo Emerson whom he greatly admired. Returning in 1917 to Argentina, he gave a course of lectures at the University of Buenos Aires on "Emerson and Ethics." These lectures became the basis of his book, *Hacia una moral sin dogmas (Toward a Morality without Dogmas)*, in which much is said about Emerson's environment, career, and ideas. The Sage of Concord, he said, "belongs to the rank of great preachers, possessed more of inspiration than logic, more of the prophet than the scientist."

The Ethical Movement in the United States and England is also discused by Ingenieros in his book on morality. Ethicism, he wrote, inspires in him much sympathy. He says:

> The characteristic of ethicism, to summarize, is not the simple affirmation of "the sovereignty of morality," to quote the title of one of Emerson's essays, but the conviction that *morality is natural and human, independent of all religious dogma and all metaphysical speculation.* Morality can originate, develop, prosper, and advance without having for its foundation the idea of supernatural realities, a transcendent divinity, or a life after death.
>
> The man who abandons his religious dogmas is obliged to intensify his moral practice in order to be a better child, parent, friend, spouse, worker, citizen. Social obligation is no less real than the theological or the metaphysical. Social sanction is as severe as the divine or the rational.

"A Fair World for All"

EDWIN H. WILSON

The way to unity among men—and to the peace that all good men desire—will be found through the United Nations, if it comes at all.

The United Nations, through its covenant, through the educational work of Unesco (the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization), through the struggle for health and welfare carried on by the World Health Organization, is assuming real moral leadership in this war-threatened world of ours. U.N. means much more than Korea; and if the long-range program of the United Nations and its agencies can but continue with adequate support—both financially and politically—there is real hope for an end of war and a fair world for all.

Anne Winslow, editor of the Carnegie Foundation's *International Conciliation,* wrote recently:

> For the timid, the United Nations stands as a fearful symbol of change; for the powerful, as a brake upon their ambitions; for the impatient, as an important tortoise; for the disillusioned, as one more weary and unavailing effort; while for others it seems like the gateway to Utopia. But there are some to whom it is none of these things but rather a patient effort to weave out of the eternal warp and woof of life a pattern more durable and more consonant with the needs of mankind. For these it represents one more adaptation of an ever-changing environment—not the pyramids and not the dinosaur, but human evolution in a faulty but searching effort to adjust to changing conditions.

So the seventh general assembly of the U.N. convened to consider serious political questions, to review the problems of dependent peoples, of refugees and the stateless, of the economic development of starving and overpopulated areas of the world. It took under consideration the wide problem of human rights.

The United Nations and its agency Unesco have good friends in the United States. A year ago last January there were 2,000 delegates from one thousand national organizations at the meetings of the U. S. National Commission on Unesco in New York City. These delegates represented the enlightened leadership of America which is endeavoring through nongovernmental organizations to help make Unesco really work as a principal international organization for a free and just world.

During 1952 it was my privilege to spend two or three days at the headquarters of the United Nations in Paris, there to interview several officials concerning the part that individuals can play through their support of nongovernmental international organizations in consultative status with Unesco, in carrying out the objectives of the United Nations. One of these aims is that of fundamental education. There are people on this planet so primitive that when the simplest notion of cause and effect begins to dawn upon them their teachers feel they are making progress. One goal is, of course, to get across to these primitive people the connection between germs and disease, between cleanliness and good health. Obstacles to peace on earth are found in disease, hunger, overpopulation, fear, ignorance, prejudice. The real war that must be fought is against these evils. And it is a constructive, educational struggle, a hopeful adventure in which through the United Nations and its agencies men are engaged. Currently, there are forces—evil forces, I hold them to be—that speak ill of the United Nations and Unesco. They would undermine its influence, send us back into the sectional competitions, ancient prejudices, narrow sectarianisms, racial discriminations, religious bigotry, that have caused the wars and perpetuated the oppressions of the world. Against all such divisive trends, U.N. works patiently for the unity of man in a free world.

Among all the enterprises to which the United Nations has devoted itself, none is more inspiring than its effort to develop the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Men and women of many nations were on the committee drafting it. Though ready for ratification in 1948, our own country has not yet ratified it. So we of America have a task to perform in making known the provisions of these measures that have been developed by the United Nations as the minimum conditions of international decency.

I have called this article "A Fair World for All" because a just, free world for all is the goal of the United Nations. But also because it is the title of a new and entrancing book* concerning the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, written by Dorothy Canfield Fisher—with a preface by Eleanor Roosevelt. The book was prepared especially for young people, is attractively illustrated, but makes excellent reading for anyone. It counteracts in a constructive way the critics who are trying to drive out of our public schools

**A Fair World for All.* The Meaning of the Declaration of Human Rights. By Dorothy Canfield Fisher. Foreword by Eleanor Roosevelt. Pictures by Jeanne Bendick. New York: Whittlesey House, 1952. 160 pp. $2.75.

discussion and appreciation of the United Nations.

It would be impossible for me to discuss all twenty-seven points of this document. You can write the Information Center, United Nations, New York City, and receive a free copy of the Declaration, I am sure. But there are some high points in the Declaration I would underscore.

First, from the preface by Eleanor Roosevelt to Mrs. Fischer's book, *A Fair World for All,* I quote these words.

> At first it was hoped that this Declaration could be short enough to be memorized by everybody, but as the work progressed it was found difficult to omit any of the thoughts finally included.
>
> The rights of human beings, as well as the responsibilities that go with them, are indeed numerous and very great. Some persons felt that the responsibilities should have been stressed with every right. We felt that we had to stress the *rights* and that one article stating the fact that responsibilities *do* go with every right would be sufficient.

The volume by Mrs. Fischer stresses the fact that behind all the things that make men different there is the same human nature, the same human needs.

These common things, it is, that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights stresses:

> All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.
>
> They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

What else have the more prophetic religious leaders of the world been saying since the days of Isaiah, days when it was declared that "All men of all nations were made of one blood to dwell together on the face of the earth"? The educational task, not only of Unesco, but of all men of good will today, is to go beyond the things that make them different to this common humanity that makes them brothers. Whoever opposes this task adds his influence to the evil forces that make for war.

And the Declaration continues with these words: "Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth by this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or social origin, or property." Here is an ideal of human equality that proposes to extend democracy across the world as a barrier to every tyrant and every tyranny.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights spells out the freedoms that must exist for all men. You will find most or many of them in our own Bill of Rights, but written freshly for a world made small by new devices of transportation and communication, written usefully at a time when some men have grown careless with our own American rights.

The document says no one shall be held in slavery. It says: "Everyone shall have the right to life, liberty and the security of person." It declares that "no one shall be subjected to torture or cruel or degrading treatment or punishment."

Then there follows a whole list of basic legal principles, formulated against official injustice. Among these are the requirements that everyone charged with a crime is entitled to a full, equal public hearing before an independent and impartial tribunal; that each person so charged is to be presumed innocent until proven guilty; that one shall not be tried for breaking a law that did not exist at the time one allegedly violated the law; and that no one shall be deprived of his property arbitrarily, or arrested, detained, or exiled arbitrarily.

These are only a few of the legal principles that are held to be fundamental human rights. These rights mean especially freedom from the midnight knock on the door and violent tearing of men from their own households without warrant or charges, the lawlessness to which the Nazis resorted.

Only careful study can do justice to this Declaration, because it goes on into rights that are newly stated as essential rights for all men—the right to work and of a livelihood; the right to education; the right to marry the person of one's own choice; the right to own property. And the right of all men, including scientists and ministers, and educators, to move from country to country and write and speak freely. Such are the rights that must be common to all men.

In spite of those who fear change and resist the program of the United Nations, the way to safety is to move forward with that program, to the level of world responsibility for freedom. The alternative of a return to chaos and anarchy is unthinkable; it would come hand in hand with war, producing a holocaust that we must not permit to happen. Instead, the science that could destroy us must, through a new faith of man in fellow man, become the means of human salvation.

That is the meaning of the new Scientific Humanism, of which such men as Julian Huxley and M. C. Otto have been talking. It is none other than the ancient dream of a new heaven and a new earth where deadly weapons shall be turned into instruments of life—not only spears into pruning hooks, but tanks and cannon into farm tractors and laboratory equipment.

Dorothy Canfield Fisher interprets these freedoms that would open the door to all people for a better life. She shows how the Universal Declaration of Human Rights implements the passion for mercy and justice that was on the lips of Micah. It implies the very use of science as an instrument of justice, welfare, and fulfillment that the Humanist of today desires. Where the ancient dream of peace and righteousness was frustrated because men lacked the power to bring them about, we say today that we can bring peace and freedom and prosperity to all men, if we lay aside our fears and with good will to one another *go to work* with the power that research gives us to solve gigantic problems.

So Mrs. Fisher, in her book *A World Fair for All,* concludes:

> Here is building material for the only bridge that will let us keep along the human road. . . . That road has led us now to the brink of a dreadful, black chasm, so deep that if we fall into it that fall will be the end of us. The name of that chasm is war—total world war. If we can get a bridge across that, we can go on building our human road into the future.

We Americans have always been builders. If we strike sail to fear, if we stop advancing on problems to solve them, we will fall away from our real selves and our destiny. We must know that the bridge can be made, made by bringing these great ideals of human freedom, these rights, into existence for all men. Then will our world be truly a democratic world, a *free* world. And then will the ancient prophets' dream of a brotherly and righteous world find fulfillment.

Proved Christianity

I was convinced—and I as so still—that the fundadental principles of Christianity have to be proved true by reasoning, and by no other method.

—*Albert Schweitzer.*

The Study Table

Freedom Is Qualitative

FATE AND FREEDOM, *By Jerome Frank. Boston: Beacon Press. Revised Edition 1953. 376 pp. $4.00.*

"Now what I want is facts," says Mr. Gradgrind in Dickens' *Hard Times.*

> "Teach these boys and girls nothing but facts. Plant nothing else, and root out everything else. You can only form the minds of reasoning animals upon facts; nothing else will ever be of any service to them. Stick to facts, sir. . . . We hope to have, before long, a board of facts, composed of commissioners of fact, who will force the people to be a people of fact, and of nothing but fact."

Judge Frank finds our democracy struggling for its future against a surfeit of Gradgrindism in which engineers, historians, sociologists, psychiatrists, and physical scientists are far too ready with micrometers, scales, and IBM machines to weigh and measure any parcel of human nature, and tell you exactly what it comes to.

Freedom is qualitative, says Jerome Frank, and it bows to nobody's dogmas, not even to the quantitative dogmas of the physicist's so-called "hard facts." Human life is still, in the main, will; and will is still, in the main, free.

Judge Frank, in sixteen muscular chapters and seven meaty appendices, goes forth to roll back the tides of scientific determinism, religious pessimism, and political doctrines of fear. His is a strong voice crying out against all determinists, whether they be Marxists, devotees of "scientific history," priests of what he calls "ascetic-fatalistic science," or just plain demagogues. Like a modern Pelagius he exalts the powers of free men to shape their destiny. Like a modern Emerson he is willing to stake his life on the sinews of self-reliance. Like a modern Jefferson he views democracy as the most cogent of compromises between anarchy and tyranny.

Originally published in 1945, and now thoroughly revised, we find here an exciting restatement of the positive values of courage, participation and growth which give to democracy its profound mission in human life.

Many of us share with the author an anxious concern over the growth of theories of "destiny" and human powerlessness. Few would be willing to undertake the enormous scholarly research which makes this book something more than an elongated essay on human freedom. We should all be properly grateful to Judge Frank. He has digested an immense amount of historical, theological, and scientific material in order to slay the dragons. Furthermore he has constructed a skillful, reasonable philosophical summary of the nature of freedom. One reads this book with a sense of refreshing relief, in spite of its frequent ponderousness. Here is a man who really has a feeling for people. Here is a man who loves independence and interdependence with equal fervor and sees no essential conflict between the two.

Judge Frank can take an old chestnut (God helps those who help themselves) and make it fresh and young again. God does help those who help themselves, but only if we perceive that we must also help one another.

What Judge Frank has to say about organized religion is satisfyingly candid even if somewhat naive. He points to churchmen's consistent demands for greater international cooperation and wonders why so many of them are blind to the divisiveness of their own institutions. He notes that all major religious groups congratulate themselves constantly that there are no longer any bloody religious persecutions, yet they perpetuate deep antagonisms of competitive indoctrination which help only to postpone the coming of brotherhood.

He seems to feel that millions of Americans are ready and eager to respond to religious institutions which would symbolize their communal, democratic religious attitudes. But it is difficult to see how this could happen until the deepest spiritual implications of democratic life and living become ingrained in something more than a creative minority in our midst.

JACK MENDELSOHN, JR.

Mixture of Gossip and Fact

APOSTLES OF DISCORD. *By Ralph Lord Roy. Boston: Beacon Press. 437 pp. $3.75.*

The book under review is, as the dust jacket says, a study of "Protestant fringe groups promoting hate and disruption." It has been praised, I learn from the same jacket, by Bishop Oxnam, Reinhold Niebuhr, Henry Smith Leiper. I am sorry to have to dissent. It seems to me that this book, a product of our confused times, only too well mirrors the chaos around us. Part of Mr. Roy's difficulty and his execrable writing result, no doubt, from the fact that he had to read a great amount of bigoted and illiterate material. That does not excuse, however, the almost complete lack of penetration and the total lack of a framework of ideas which would help us to understand the extent of the danger presented by the greater part of the people he discusses. In spite of the fact that at least part of this book was submitted as a doctoral dissertation at Union Theological Seminary, there is no evidence of scholarship. The author makes no real attempt to evaluate his materials nor does he attempt to explore the roots of the evils he discusses or to explain the weeds springing from them. He is content to throw together, with no critical discrimination, in a most confusing way, a mixture of gossip and fact. The publication of this book is extremely unfortunate, especially at this time, when we desperately need to understand the very real peril we are facing in our country.

Mr. Roy is nothing if not superficial but he is worse than that. In a chapter titled, "No Popery!"—Bigotry's Battlecry, [sic], he discusses the organization known as Protestants and Others United for Separation of Church and State. His discussion is irresponsible. Let me illustrate what I mean by a quotation. Mr. Roy says that there are three attitudes which Protestants hold towards separation of church and state. The first attitude is this:

> First there is the "secularist" or humanist position with effective spokesmen among the theological "left-wing" of all major denominations. While less numerous than others, those who hold this position include many professional educators who have more influence than their numbers might suggest. They claim to find in the First Amendment a "wall" between church and state—and they are vociferous in espousing this interpretation of the Constitution.

If you look carefully at the way in which the author has used his epithets in that passage you will understand some of my criticisms. I happen to be a Theist—a guest in your magazine this month. I am surprised to

learn that Humanists have a monopoly on this attitude. And how are we to characterize Thomas Jefferson who knew something about the "wall of separation"? Was he a "Humanist," a "Secularist" or just a "left-winger"? I propose that we have a new cult, the "Vociferists." Since I contrived the word, probably incorrectly, I have made myself the first member.

One would expect that a book based on a doctoral dissertation would present evidence carefully. In this chapter Mr. Roy tells us that some of the important backers of the POAU are the American Humanist Association, the American Jewish Congress, and the American Ethical Union. He then goes on to say that "certain critics of the POAU have contended that the 'other Americans' have more influence than the Protestants in the policies of the organization." Whether or not this is true seems to me totally irrelevant, but what evidence is there that this is true? Am I wrong in detecting anti-Semitism in this kind of sentence? You will see why I am suspicious when you read this sentence that comes near the end of the section I am talking about: "Most of POAU's leaders have attempted to avoid any concession to unreasoned hate. A few, however, stand upon the edge of the chasm of bigotry." That seems to me plain dishonest writing. It is, to put it clearly, contemptible.

The section on Mr. Fritchman is downright misleading. I say this as one who has no sympathy with Mr. Fritchman whatever. Let me quote only one sentence:

> Several minor incidents would seem to indicate that, unable to reach positions of importance within the official headquarters of Unitarian organizations, the communist-liners have decided to work from the bottom up.

The author then tells us that two units of the UFSJ "engaged in disputes over the extremist political philosophies of some of their members." Whatever that may mean, and I leave you to figure it out, that is all the evidence he presents. Mr. Roy goes on to say that these chapters were disavowed by their churches but the implication that there is an attempt to take over Unitarianism still stands.

Save your money and your time and forget this book. Read instead the statement issued recently by the Presbyterian Church. You will learn more from that courageous and intelligent statement in five minutes than you will learn from this book in five hours.

J. Bryan Allin.

Something of Everything

Encyclopedia of Aberrations. *Edited by Edward Podolsky, M.D. New York: Philosophical Library. 550 pp. $10.00.*

This reference book helps those who are seriously in search of information on mental health. *Aberration* is construed to mean deviation from the normal, in drinking, in dreams, in hostility, in love, etc. Those who think only of sex aberration will be disappointed, but will find the usual answers to this.

The book is not exactly an encyclopedia. For instance, the word *agoraphobia* is defined in three lines, whereas one would certainly expect to find some reference to the classic example of William Ellery Leonard. Actually the book is something of everything. It is a compilation of materials, including the editor's definitions, in alphabetical order, with several articles taken from professional journals, although there is none from the *American Journal of Psychiatry*. The editor fails to take into account the new classification terminology adopted by the American Psychiatric Association in 1950. It does include an article on *"Psychopathic Personality"* which term has been dropped from the official classifications. Psychosomatic ailments are not discussed as such.

The editor, a member of the staff of the State University of New York Medical College, has made a significant start toward giving the average person a handy reference work in this vital field. As pointed out by Alexandra Adler in the Introduction, it is Freudian-slanted.

Harold P. Marley.

The Self and Organic Unity

The Nature of the Self, a Functional Interpretation. *By Risieri Frondizi. New Haven: Yale Unisity Press. 210 pp. $4.00.*

What can we legitimately think about the nature of the self? The author of this clearly written book gives what he calls a "functional" interpretation of the self. Formerly a professor in his native land of Argentina, Frondizi is now at the University of Puerto Rico.

The first half of the book is concerned with the way in which Descartes' theory of the self as an immutable substance has been criticized in part or whole by certain philosophers. Locke, for example, changed the idea of substance into a "meaningless, unknowable point of reference for qualities"; Berkeley dropped it altogether from matter; and Hume held its nonexistence and uselessness in the psychical realm.

In the latter half of the book, Frondizi states his "functional" theory of the self. He points out that we cannot deny the existence of our experiences. But there is something more than just the experiences or even a stream of experiences. It is the ego or self. The self, however, is not an unchangeable substance supporting experiences. A sharp distinction must be made between thinking of the self as immutable and as permanent; the two should not be confused. The self is not an immutable reality, but nevertheless it has permanence. Thus the unity and the continuity of the self is recognized. The other truth is that the self is also a changing reality, for change is not incompatible with permanence, but complements it. "We are not given a ready-made self; we create our own self daily by what we do, what we experience." (P. 145.) Frondizi, therefore, aims at an idea of the self that allows for both change and permanence as essential elements. A co-ordinated structure of activities, he says, holds our experiences together and gives us personality. ". . . the self is a complex unity undergoing a constant process; everything that happens to it affects, to a greater or less degree, its totality. The self is not something that can be divided in pieces but an organic, indissoluble unity." (P. 149.)

With regard to philosophy in general, the following sentences of the author are worth quoting:

"Within a sane philosophical system one has no right to postulate metaphysical beings which serve to fill in the gaps left by an inadequate empirical analysis." (P. 138.) "But it is a prudent measure of philosophical hygiene to throw overboard concepts that have lost their meaning and real content." (P. 140.)

John H. Hershey.

Quick Reference

THE AMERICAN CHURCH OF THE PROTESTANT HERITAGE. *Edited by Vergilius Ferm. New York: Philosophical Library. $6.00.*

This is a brief review of the major Protestant bodies in America and a few minor ones: Moravians, Unitarians, Universalists, Friends, Church of the Brethren, Seventh Day Adventists, Evangelical Mission Covenant, and Church of God. Each group is presented by one of its own members. Each discussion consists of a brief historical review and a "sales talk," plus a bibliography. The chapters vary in adequacy, depending upon the author.

This is a valuable contribution as a quick reference work. We regret, however, that there is still no attempt, either to explain the groups in terms of sociological conditions and psychological appeals, or to make any really trenchant evaluation of them.

SYLVANUS M. DUVALL.

Important New Books

A READER'S GUIDE TO T. S. ELIOT. *By George Williamson. New York: The Noonday Press. 248 pp. $3.50.*

A READING OF GEORGE HERBERT. *By Rosamond Tuve. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 215 pp. $5.00.*

PEOPLE, PLACES AND BOOKS. *By Gilbert Highet. New York: Oxford University Press. 277 pp. $3.50.*

DANTE'S DRAMA OF THE MIND. *By Francis Fergusson. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 232 pp. $4.00.*

WHAT CAN I KNOW? *By Herrymon Maurer. New York: Harper and Brothers. 253 pp. $3.50.*

SIGRID UNDSET. *By A. H. Winsnes. New York: Sheed and Ward. 258 pp. $3.00.*

SHEAVES. *By Rabindranath Tagore. New York: Philosophical Library. 152 pp. $2.50.*

T. S. Eliot is the outstanding poet of the present time. He is, however, influenced by the seventeenth century from which he gets his nourishment. Professor Williamson has written a much needed commentary on Eliot's writing; but to understand Eliot thoroughly it is necessary to study Professor Tuve's important commentary on George Herbert, one of the greatest poets of the seventeenth century. These two books should be read together. One of the most interesting movements of the present time is the interest in the Great Books. Professor Highet, one of the most learned men of this generation, has here brought together his radio discussions of the great books. This is a fascinating book. It is the product of a wise, tolerant, cultivated mind. Be sure to read and digest this book. Dante is one of the Great Books. He is of perennial interest. Most readers, however, do not get beyond the *Inferno*. Here is a much needed commentary on the *Purgatorio*. It is well-written and impeccable in its scholarship. This book will make Dante live for you, and Dante is important. When we turn to Herrymon Maurer, we leave the great books for metaphysics. This book will make you reëxamine not only your values, but also will warm you. With a truly world outlook, Maurer has taught in China and is thoroughly at home with Oriental thought. He sums up the purpose of life thus: "It is to listen for encounters with God's facts." This book is not easy reading, but it is rewarding. Sigrid Undset is today almost forgotten both in Europe and in America. In 1928 she received the Nobel Prize, but that does not guarantee immortality. Professor Winsnes gives a careful discussion of Mrs. Undset with much attention to her religious beliefs. In 1924 she was received into the Catholic Church. Tagore has become a part of world literature. In 1913 he was awarded the Nobel prize for literature. Knighted by the English Government, he later repudiated the knighthood because of England's oppression in India. He took his stand with Gandhi. They were victorious. Tagore represents the great message of India for modern times. Today the world is turning to India for leadership. Read Tagore.

C. A. HAWLEY.

Imperishable

I am life; I am love,
Immortal living things;
I am laughter, gaiety
And riches of all kings.

I make sadness in some men
And loneliness at times,
Yet I too bring gladness
By simple church bell chimes.

I make brightness when it rains
And take grey clouds away.
I bring stars into night
And sunshine into day.

I bring music into hearts
And laughter sweet and bright.
I show the way when men are low
From darkness into light.

I am all—all life itself
One never sees me die.
I am life and love, my friend,
Reach for me—up high!

AVONNE D. BALLIN.

THE FIELD

(*Continued from page* 66)

duction "clearly should not be judged by occasional suggestive passages, but by the effect of the production as a whole." The ACLU had further urged that no production should be held obscene "unless it presents a clear and present danger of incitement to lustful and unlawful acts."

Providence police closed the play months ago on grounds that it was "indecent" and "immoral." Following this, Providence District Court found Mr. Gould guilty of staging an obscene play and fined him $100 and costs. These penalties were wiped out by the appeal court's dismissal of the case.

In its memorandum, the ACLU charged that the ban on the play was a violation of the free expression guaranties of both the Federal and Rhode Island Constitutions. Urging the application of the "clear and present danger" standard, the memorandum said: "Unless an objective test of this kind is imposed, the subjective attitude of the censor or the police authority becomes increasingly important in determining what is permissible and what is not."

ACLU Bulletin.

Western Unitarian Conference

700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary

CONTINUUM

In the last issue of UNITY we presented the personnel involved in the operation of the Western Unitarian Conference, the Council of Religious Liberals, and the Board of the American Unitarian Association. Western Conference people are active also on various committees of the A.U.A. and other national organizations. Thus we continue the listings.

WESTERN CONFERENCE PERSONNEL ON A.U.A. COMMITTEES

Division of Churches:

Advisory Council—
Tracy M. Pullman, Detroit, chairman
John W. Cyrus, Omaha
Mrs. George W. Pieksen

Extension Committee—
Tracy M. Pullman, Detroit
Mrs. George W. Pieksen, St. Louis
Frank H. Schramm, Burlington
Robert T. Weston, Louisville

Department of Ministry Committee—
John W. Cyrus, Omaha, chairman
Robert T. Weston, Louisville

World Churches Committee—
Rudolph Gilbert, Denver
Mrs. George W. Pieksen, St. Louis

Division of Education:

Advisory Council—
Mrs. Paul Caskey, Rockford, chairman
Robert T. Weston, Louisville

Youth Work Committee—
Mrs. Paul Caskey, Rockford

Adult Education Committee—
Mrs. Harry Burns, Cincinnati

Division of Publications:

Editorial Advisory Board—
James Luther Adams, Chicago, chairman
J. Bryan Allin, Chicago
Edwin T. Buehrer, Chicago
Thaddeus B. Clark, St. Louis
John W. Cyrus, Omaha

Pamphlet Commission—
Edwin T. Buehrer, Chicago
Thaddeus B. Clark, St. Louis
John W. Cyrus, Omaha

Commission on Unitarian Inter-Group Relations:

Arthur Foote, St. Paul

Editorial Board of the CHRISTIAN REGISTER:

Wallace W. Robbins, Chicago
Ralph F. Fuchs, Bloomington (Indiana)

Committees of the General Conference of the A.U.A.:

Business Committee—
Mrs. Ralph Hicks, Evanston

Program Committee—
Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., Rockford

Nominating Committee—
Mrs. Harry Burns, Cincinnati

W.U.C. PERSONNEL IN OTHER NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Unitarian Ministers Association:

Executive Committee—
Leslie T. Pennington, Chicago

Western Conference Branch—
John W. Brigham, Sioux City
John W. Cyrus, Omaha
Charles W. Phillips, Des Moines
Arnold F. Westwood, Urbana

General Alliance:

Vice-Presidents—
Mrs. Harry Burns, Cincinnati
Mrs. Ralph Hicks, Evanston

Directors—
Mrs. John K. Selden, Toledo
Mrs. Lewis A. McGee, Chicago
Mrs. C. Kenneth Ross, Omaha

Education Committee—
Mrs. J. Bryan Allin, Chicago, chairman
Miss Elaine Burstatte, Chicago
Mrs. Howard B. Hauze, Chicago
Mrs. Lewis McGee, Chicago
Mrs. Raymond Palmer, Riverside
Mrs. Carl Pleak, Hobart
Mrs. C. A. Purdy, Hinsdale

National Leadership Training Conference—
Mrs. Lewis McGee, Chicago, chairman
Mrs. Howard B. Hauze, Chicago
Mrs. Randall S. Hilton, Chicago
Mrs. Malcolm Knowles, Wilmette
Mrs. G. Richard Kuch, Chicago
Mrs. Malcolm McDougall, Chicago
Mrs. Frank E. Nutt, Glenview

Nominating Committee—
Mrs. Randall S. Hilton, Chicago

Laymen's League:

Vice-President—Gardner Williams, Toledo

Council Members—
Ruby D. Garrett, Kansas City
Albert MacCleary, Birmingham
Morton Bennett, Cincinnati
Arthur E. Bestor, Jr., Urbana
Donald Carey, Grosse Pointe

American Unitarian Youth:

Vice-President—Jean Grant, Cedar Rapids

Council Members—
Virginia Dregger, Minneapolis
Paula Fritze, Des Moines

United Unitarian Appeal:

Vice-President—C. David Connolly, Rockford

Board of Directors—Mrs. George W. Pieksen, St. Louis

Unitarian Service Committee:

Board of Directors—
Mrs. George W. Pieksen, St. Louis
Curtis W. Reese, Chicago
Mrs. George Wakerlin, Chicago
Julius E. Warren, St. Louis

Unitarian Minister's Wives Association:

Mrs. Tracy M. Pullman, Detroit, President.

BY-LAW NOTICE

The Board of Directors is preparing a substitute for Article V, section 4, "Committee on Resolutions." The present By-law reads:

> "The Board of Directors shall select a Committee on Resolutions of three members, two of whom shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. The Committee may select its own chairman. The Committee shall review all resolutions proposed for action at an annual meeting which are mailed to the secretary of the corporation not less than thirty days prior thereto. The Committee shall not pass upon the merits of a resolution, nor alter it except with the consent of its proponent. The Committee shall seek to expedite discussion of resolutions by asking consent of their proponents to combine, divide, withdraw, and clarify resolutions as required. The Committee shall also establish means whereby the delegates present at an annual meeting may promptly determine how many and which resolutions shall be considered. Resolutions not a part of the regular business of the meeting and not mailed to the secretary thirty days prior to the annual meeting shall not be considered at the meeting except upon the affirmative vote of three-fourths of the delegates present and voting."

The proposed new By-law would read:

> "The Board of Directors shall select a committee on resolutions consisting of three persons. The committee shall review all resolutions proposed for action at an annual meeting which have been received by the secretary at least sixty days prior thereto. The Committee shall seek to expedite discussion of resolutions by asking consent of their proposers to combine, divide, withdraw, or clarify resolutions as required. The Committee shall send copies of qualifying resolutions to the churches and fellowships thirty days before the annual meeting. The Committee shall submit to the annual meeting, with or without recommendation, all qualifying resolutions. Any changes made by the Committee without the consent of the proposer shall be offered as amendments or substitutions. Resolutions not a part of the regular business of the meeting and not mailed to the secretary sixty days prior to the annual meeting may be considered on a three-fourths vote of the delegates present if the matters of concern in said resolutions have arisen since the expiration of the sixty-day time limit."

RESOLUTIONS

Under the present By-laws, resolutions to be considered at the Annual Meeting of the Western Unitarian Conference must be in the office of the secretary thirty days prior to the meeting. The 1954 Annual Meeting will be held in St. Louis on Saturday, May 1st. Therefore resolutions must be in the Conference office not later than April 1st.

ACTION BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS

The Board of Directors of the Western Unitarian Conference met in Chicago, January 20th. The following actions were taken:

1. The appointment of the Resolutions Committee, consisting of Arthur Foote of St. Paul, Maurice Visscher and Carl Storm of Minneapolis.

2. The appointment of the Nominating Committee, consisting of Kenneth C. Walker (912 Hastings Drive, Bloomington, Illinois), chairman; John W. Cyrus, Omaha; John K. Hammon, Indianapolis; Mrs. Francis Hughes, Detroit; Homer A. Jack, Evanston; and John W. Kinneman, Bloomington.

3. Recognition of the Rocky Mountain Conference as a sub-region.

4. Voted to receive monies from churches, fellowships, and other organizations within the Western Unitarian Conference for the purpose of investing for them, the principal to be returnable on sixty days' notice. Details on request.

5. Accepted gifts to the General Fund from the Geneseo Church totaling $5,650.

6. Approved the action of the Executive Committee in electing Curtis W. Reese to the position of Treasurer of the Conference to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of Herbert E. Clapham due to ill health.

7. Voted to give a copy of *Freedom Moves West* to each new minister coming to the Conference and to the seniors of Meadville Theological School.

UNITARIAN-UNIVERSALIST COOPERATION

In October the Board of the Western Unitarian Conference and the Board of the Midwest Universalist Conference each appointed five members to a joint committee on mutual cooperation. The Unitarian members of the committee are Edwin T. Buehrer, Randall S. Hilton (chairman), Melvin Mather, Leslie T. Pennington, and Miss Hazel Williams. The Universalists appointed Carleton Fisher, John S. MacPhee (secretary), Robert Rice, Donald Thompson, and Mrs. Edgar Wilson.

The committee met in Chicago on January 12th. Recommendations were made to the boards of the two organizations looking toward closer cooperation of summer institutes. It was also recommended that the Western Unitarian Conference and the Midwest Unitarian Conference should encourage sub-regional or state organizations to establish extension committees. These committees will work independently but should coordinate their activities.

ROCKFORD CALLS MINISTER

Victor B. Goff, minister of the Follen Church Society, East Lexington, Massachusetts, has been called to the ministry of the Church of the Christian Union, Unitarian, Rockford, Illinois. Mr. Goff is a graduate of the University of Oregon and Union Theological Seminary. He will begin his ministry in Rockford on March 1.

QUINCY INSTALLATION

The Unitarian Church of Quincy, Illinois, installed Thomas J. Maloney as its minister, Sunday, January 31. Rev. E. T. Buehrer, President of the Western Unitarian Conference, gave the sermon.

CINCINNATI HEIRS

The Peoples Church of Cincinnati has liquidated its assets and divided them equally between the First Unitarian Church and St. John's Unitarian Church. Both churches are now planning capital fund drives to inaugurate or complete building programs. The First Unitarian Church will have the assistance of the Wells Organizations.

Geneva—June 27 to July 3, 1954